



**DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION  
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes – July 21, 2006 (amended)**

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Dave Whitmer, California Agriculture Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)  
Barbara Todd, Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)  
Syed Ali, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)  
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)  
Bryan Eya, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)  
Martha Harnly, Department of Health Services (DHS-EHIB)  
Anna Fan, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)  
Matt Hengel, (UC DAVIS)  
Tobi Jones, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

Visitors in Attendance:

Denise Webster, DPR  
Pam Wofford, DPR  
Eileen Mahoney, DPR  
Jeanne Martin, DPR  
Randy Segawa, DPR  
David Supkoff, DPR  
John Pearson, Compliance Services  
Robert Schlag, OEHHA  
Nasser Dean, Western Plant Health Assn.  
Cynthia Tuck, CAL/EPA  
Patricia Gouveia, SWRCB  
Angela Csondes, ARB/SSD  
Pamela Hedin, DPR  
Jerry Campbell, DPR  
Paul Gosselin, DPR  
Ann Prichard, DPR  
Stan Van Vleck, Stern, Van Vleck & Ruchmann LLP  
Tony Pironduci, City of Vacaville/CVCWA

1. Introductions and Committee Business - Tobi Jones, Chairperson

- a. About 27 people attended the meeting.
- b. A correction was noted for the minutes of the previous meeting held on May 19, 2006.



2. Development of the Goods Movement Action Plan: Cindy Tuck, Cal/EPA, Assistant Secretary for Policy

Cal/EPA Assistant Secretary for Policy Cindy Tuck gave a presentation to the Committee regarding the development of the Goods Movement Action Plan (the "GMAP"). This is a plan that Cal/EPA and the California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BTH) are jointly developing. The purpose of the plan is to integrate actions to address the State's goods movement infrastructure needs with actions to address public health and environmental impact mitigation, community impact mitigation, workforce development, and security enhancements. Two of the policies underlying the development of the GMAP are that: (1) the State's economy and quality of life depend upon the efficient, safe delivery of goods to and from the ports and borders; and (2) at the same time, the environmental impacts from goods movement must be reduced to ensure protection of public health.

In September of 2005, the two agencies issued the Phase I "Foundations" report that describes the needs and challenges that the state faces relative to goods movement. This report is available at <[calepa.ca.gov](http://calepa.ca.gov)>. This report serves as the foundation for the development of the GMAP. In Phase I, the two agencies noted that emissions from goods movement sources (such as ships, trains, and trucks) are already high and are expected to increase with increased trade. Based on the emission-related findings in the Phase I report, a key part of the Goods Movement Action Plan will be the Air Resources Board's (ARB's) Emission Reduction Plan for Ports and Goods Movement in California. The ARB Board approved this plan in April of this year.

To gain stakeholder input, Cal/EPA and BTH have been conducting an extensive public process during the last year for the development of the GMAP. This process includes work group meetings, meetings of an Integrating Work Group, meetings in affected communities, and the review of extensive written comments from the public.

The GMAP will be based on addressing the following goods movement corridors as one system: (1) Los Angeles/Long Beach and the Inland Empire; (2) San Diego (with focus on the border); (3) the Central Valley; and (4) the Bay Area. The current draft Framework for Action (available at Cal/EPA's Website) outlines draft preliminary candidate actions in a summary chart and by each of the four goods movement corridors.

If approved by the voters in November, the Transportation Bond will require the California Transportation Commission to consult the GMAP prior to allocating \$2 billion for infrastructure projects along trade corridors. The Transportation Bond also proposes \$1 billion for the funding of emission reduction projects related to the movement of freight along California's trade corridors. This money, if appropriated by the Legislature, would be allocated by ARB.

Currently, Cal/EPA and BTH are working through issues related to the development of the plan. Cal/EPA and BTH plan to issue a draft-final of the GMAP later this year, hold another Integrating Work Group meeting after the issuance of the draft, and finalize the plan by the end of the year.

3. DPR's Pesticide Air Initiative – Paul Gosselin, Chief Deputy Director, DPR, and Denise Webster, Registration Branch.

A. Overview of DPR's Initiative:

Paul Gosselin discussed DPR's comprehensive initiative to improve air quality that was launched in May 2006. The initiative (which targets air toxins and smog-producing chemicals from pesticide emissions) will achieve state air quality goals for pesticides by 2008 and set a national standard. The Pesticide Air Initiative will involve a regulatory framework that will exceed DPR's commitment to reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from agricultural and commercial structural pesticides in nonattainment areas, as outlined in the 1994 State Implementation Plan (SIP). The emphasis on reducing VOC emissions from pesticides will also be done in a way that reduces pesticide toxic risk and drift. The Pesticide Air Initiative will help California meet its future air quality challenges by providing the regulated community with viable options that will effectively reduce VOC emissions from pesticides. The regulatory concepts and programmatic commitments will be developed into a strategy that will be a component of SIP 2007.

Paul discussed the strategy to achieve reductions that are measurable and enforceable. DPR's approach will advance the increased use of lower VOC-containing pesticides (e.g., via reformulation and switching products) and the adoption of application practices that reduce emissions (e.g., pesticide use reduction, VOC degradation, adsorption). Through DPR regulatory authority, VOC emission reductions can be enacted that will be reflected in the VOC emission inventory. These reductions will come from the use of lower VOC-containing products, reduction of VOC emissions on a per-acre basis, and from application methods that reduce VOC emissions.

DPR's focus for reducing pesticide VOC emissions will be based upon a reduction in VOC emissions from traditional pesticide applications, and upon a shift in pest control practices. To achieve these two goals, DPR will focus on four elements:

- Reducing emissions from fumigants (which currently account for about one-fourth of all pesticide pounds applied annually);
- Reformulating other pesticide products to reduce emissions and risks;
- Promoting new, more environmentally friendly technologies; and
- Developing strategic pest management partnerships in concert with the regulated community.

Paul discussed these four components of the strategy in more detail and indicated that a concept paper detailing implementations options would be published soon. Three workshops will be held in August to solicit comments on the implementation options. Public comments will be accepted until September 1, 2006.

B. The Reformulation as an Air Initiative Element:

Denise Webster provided a status update on the reformulation reevaluation, California Notice 2005-06. This update expanded on information provided at the May 2006 meeting.

**Certain Agricultural and Commercial Structural-use Liquid Formulation Pesticide Products (Reformulation)**

**Initiated:** May 31, 2005

**Basis:** Staff analyses indicate that reformulation could result in significant VOC reductions throughout the state.

**Product Count:** 748 products from 177 registrants

**Data:** Registrants are required to choose one of three options for each product by August 1, 2005. .

An extension was granted until March 1, 2006.

Written commitment to reformulate

Request for exemption

Detailed explanation as to why product cannot be reformulated.

Currently registered products from  
164 registrants (as of 7-13-06)

**618**

Number of products with written commitments to reformulate pending review:	57
Number of products exempt* from reformulation (*TGA data demonstrate VOC emission potentials below 20%)	298
Number of products responding to reformulation:	218
Number of products subject to cancellation:	45
<b>Total products:</b>	<b>618</b>

Here is how the 218 products that responded to reformulation fall out:

- 111 provided a detailed reason why reformulation is not feasible or contrary to VOC reduction. These individual responses have to be reviewed by the Environmental Monitoring Branch and looked at as a whole for consistency.

- 107 requested a waiver from reformulation. A little over half of these have ThermoGravimetric Analysis (TGA) data on file and are pending review by our Environmental Monitoring Branch.

And finally, those products that are subject to cancellation can be placed into two groups.

- 30 products provided an unacceptable response.
- 15 products did not respond at all.

Management will decide how to handle products for which no response was received.

4. Triclosan and Triclocarban in Pesticide Products in California as related to Publicly Owned Treatment Works Concerns –Eileen Mahoney, Registration Branch

The chair introduced this topic as requested by member Syed Ali, and provided the article previously identified by Dr. Ali. The article discusses the findings of these two components in sediments from wastewater treatment plants. Eileen Mahoney discussed the uses of these compounds in registered pesticide products.

Triclocarban (chemical code 844) has not been registered by DPR since 12/31/1994. The only other product ever registered was inactive as of 11/27/1984. In all cases, the inclusion of triclocarban appears at low levels (1.0% in each product).

Triclosan (chemical code 1371) is the trivial name for 5-Chloro-2-(2,4-dichlorophenoxy)phenol. The chemical is actively registered in two products. Both are industrial use preservative products for use on textiles, cordage, etc. Inactive products (30) include home use hard surface cleaners, laundry conditioners, plastic bags with incorporated antimicrobial, and cleaners for tanning salon beds. Again, the percentage of ingredient is quite low – less than 3.0%.

Under the Toxic Substance Control Act, U.S. EPA considers Triclosan a “High Production Volume” chemical. It is used in many home-use products including toothpaste, bar soap, liquid hand soap, dishwashing soap, etc., these uses are not pesticidal. It is also incorporated in plastic products – cutting boards, baby toys, and similar hard products.

Chemicals may have uses other than as pesticides, depending on their chemistry and chemical properties. USDA, FDA, or U.S. EPA, depending on the niche products occupy, may regulate these non-pesticidal uses. Sodium hypochlorite is an example – fabric bleach and whitener (not a pesticide); mildew and mold remover (pesticide); swimming pool algicide (pesticide); industrial uses (not a pesticide).

The chair indicated the triclosan manufacturer had recently provided data presented to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on environmental behavior as it relates to non-pesticidal use. The chair is evaluating whether to invite the manufacturer to speak to the Pesticide Registration And Evaluation Committee. There was discussion about the disadvantage of widespread use of antimicrobial substances from a resistance management standpoint.

5. Registration Activity for FY05-06- David Supkoff, Registration Branch

David Supkoff presented an overview of Registration Branch activities during the past fiscal year (2005/2006). David reported that in the last fiscal year the Registration took 6,584 actions on 5,610 submissions with 1566 products registered (licensed). During that period, the Branch registered 19 new active ingredients, 3 of which were designated by U.S. EPA as a reduced risk. During the calendar year ending December 31, 2005, DPR issued 16 Emergency Exemptions (Section 18) and 20 Special Local Need (SLN) registrations renewed the licenses for 10,493 products and brought in approximately \$7,900,000 in license renewal fees.

6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting- Tobi Jones, DPR

The next meeting will be held on Friday, September 15, 2006, in the Sierra Hearing Room located on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building.

7. Closing Comments - Tobi Jones

The meeting was adjourned.